



**Board for International Food & Agricultural Development (BIFAD)
Public Meeting on “The Next Generation: Global Food Security Through Human
and Institutional Capacity Building”
Meeting Minutes**

**October 11, 2011
Des Moines Marriot
700 Grand Avenue, Salons A & B
Des Moines, Iowa**

Contents

Welcome and opening remarks.....	2
Human and Institutional Capacity Task Force Update.....	3
Research Forum Report.....	3
CRSP Listening Session.....	3
USAID Feed the Future Program.....	4
Public Comments.....	6
Panel 1: Perspectives on Human Institutional Capacity Development from the Next Generation of Hunger Fisheries.....	8
Q&A.....	9
Panel 2: Human and Institutional Capacity Development – Experts and Perspectives.....	10
Q&A.....	13
Public Comments.....	14



**Board for International Food and Agricultural Development
U.S. Agency for International Development, Ronald Reagan Building, Room 7.8-061, 1300 Pennsylvania Ave NW,
Washington, DC 20523-2110**

**BIFAD Public Meeting on “The Next Generation: Global Food Security Through
Human and Institutional Capacity Building”
Meeting Minutes**

Board Members Present:

*Brady Deaton, Catherine Bertini, Jo Luck, William (Bill) DeLauder, Elsa Murano,
Gebisa Ejeta*

**Welcome and Opening Remarks (Brady Deaton, BIFAD Chair & Chancellor,
University of Missouri)**

Brady Deaton welcomed everyone to the second BIFAD meeting of 2011 and conducted introductions. Following introductions, Brady Deaton outlined the agenda for the day and informed attendees that they would have an opportunity at each juncture to speak and provide input.

Brady Deaton said that as Presidentially-appointed advisors to the Administrator of USAID, the Board will be drawing on all perspectives to improve the work of USAID. Chair Deaton emphasized that the Title XII Act authorizes five different program components as that require special attention:

- Human and Institutional Capacity Development (HICD)
- Collaborative Research Support Programs (CRSPs)
- Engaging international agricultural service
- Program support to research
- Special programs related to agricultural projects

The BIFAD website contains the 2009-2010 report to Congress describing the 54 active Title XII projects across the above five program areas. The Board also sees itself as engaging higher education and technology in a broad arena within the context of USAID FORWARD's seven key areas:

- Implementation and procurement reform
- Talent management
- Policy capacity
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Budget management
- Science and technology
- Innovation

Brady Deaton noted that the Board formed a budget committee chaired by Marty McVey to develop a budget request that would enable the Board to aggressively move forward toward reaching BIFAD's goals. The committee asked for substantial improvement in the budget. In response, USAID granted additional budget support. Administrator Shah in his response to BIFAD pledged himself to continuing to support a well-involved BIFAD. Administrator Shah also indicated a more direct role for BIFAD in support of key countries and programs addressing special studies, working groups, and participating in US and international conferences.

Human and Institutional Capacity Development Task Force

Gebisa Ejeta, chair of the Human and Institutional Capacity Development Subcommittee, provided an update on the Board's efforts toward drafting a consensus document on the topic. The committee was able to obtain all of the agency documents and studies relating to human capacity development over the last several years and evaluate them with the yeoman assistance of Dr. John Becker. Dr. Becker developed an outline for the committee to use as a skeleton for its draft. Prior to getting a recommendation to the Administrator, the Board will have Feed the Future focus country attention, Feed the Future non-focus country observations, Feed the Future trilateral cooperation activities, and Feed the Future multilateral cooperation activities.

The basic premise behind the document is the Administrator's concerns and intentions regarding the need for human capacity building and institutional strengthening. Bill DeLauder expressed his concern that for years this particular subject has not been a priority of USAID and that the case for making this a priority requires attention since it is a longer-term effort. Given all of the documents and reports acquired by the subcommittee, Elsa Murano emphasized the importance of the Board familiarizing itself with all of USAID's previous efforts in the field of capacity development prior to making a recommendation. Catherine Bertini and Bill DeLauder both noted the importance of short-term goals and benchmarks in order to maintain long-term political support for capacity building initiatives. The deadline that the subcommittee set for itself is to have a draft document by April. Brady Deaton said that part of the Board's budget request was to enable the Board to meet more frequently.

Haiti 2010 Earthquake Agricultural Priorities Task Force

Elsa Murano said that the task force submitted its report to Administrator Shah in January. The recommendations focused on the "how" rather than the "what" to do in Haiti. The best way to assist countries like Haiti is to develop a long-range plan. The task force found that project objectives in Haiti would change rapidly so there was little continuity across projects. The task force's recommendation is to establish a consortium of land grant universities that would be the independent agent between the funding agencies like USAID and USDA. Having land grant universities involved would be that scientists would be highly engaged in the drafting of a plan and pursuing progress. The Agency is currently considering the task force's recommendations. The next step is to get a report from the Agency as to what has been done, what is being done, and what is planning to be done in Haiti.

MSI Group

Bill DeLauder updated the Board on the MSI group initiative. The initiative was unique in that it brought together three major minority serving institutions to work together on looking commonalities and common strengths. In the Title XII report, one of the priorities stated by USAID was to work on enhancing the engagement of MSI institutions in USAID programs. The primary task of Bill DeLauder's working group has been met and a report has been submitted to USAID.

Research Forum Report

Brady Deaton said that the Feed the Future final report of consultation with the international research community is now available and will be available on the web in several days. BIFAD will develop a response to that report and provide it to the USAID administration. The process of formulating a response will occur between now and the Board's April meeting. Bill DeLauder added that he did not think that the Board captured all of what could be considered Title XII activities in the report. Susan Owens noted that direct funding for Title XII was captured but that all of the university work that is drawing on the funding as a supplement was not captured.

CRSP Listening Session

A suggestion that came out of the CRSP listening session was that BIFAD reinstitute an awards program where there would be a BIFAD chair award given to a principal investigator among the CRSPs as well as a graduate student. Chair Deaton indicated that he would immediately appoint a subcommittee to pull together the review and nomination process and the format by which the awards could be brought to public attention.

When the Board looks at what CRSPs are doing, the Agency needs to recognize the whole of the university approach to CRSP work. The listening session gave the Board a shot of adrenalin and everyone realizes the potential for cutting edge work and leveraging a powerful system of research and education. It was the first time that the BIFAD group met with the full CRSP council.

Discussion

Jo Luck extended an invitation to the Board to meet in Little Rock, Arkansas. Hotel rooms are available and are being held until a final commitment can be made. Chair Deaton was highly enthused about the prospect of a Little Rock meeting.

USAID Feed the Future Research Programs (Rob Bertram, Director of the Office of Agriculture, Research and Policy for the Bureau for Food Security, USAID)

Rob Bertram updated the Board on the processes that are going through the USAID in developing strategies. After the June research forum, listening to members of the US university community, international partners, and non-researchers – a structured research portfolio was developed with the help of colleagues from McKenzie. USAID looked at poverty, malnutrition, major systems, poor farmers, wealthier farmers, gender, climate change, and the strategic interests of the United States. Ultimately, this led to the emergence of key priorities that we thought would break down obstacles in terms of moving productivity and sustainability forward. At the end of the day, the new Feed the Future research portfolio emerged. One innovation in terms of management will be having the same person manage the CRSP program with the new CGIAR.

A second innovation, or big idea, is addressing specific diseases of key food security crops and livestock or animals. The United States can marshal scientific resources that in many cases other countries cannot. For example, in cassava, USAID is working with the Dan Forest Center on virus resistance. USAID is also working on East Coast fever in partnership with USDA. Through targeted efforts perhaps breakthroughs and

transformational changes in food security systems that support many people in the developing world can be made.

USAID is engaged in an intense grain legumes effort with university partners and the USDA. One piece of this effort is with the National Institute of Food and Agriculture in developing competitive approaches. USAID also wants to see how agriculture can be used to drive the diet by making sure that legumes are available and affordable, as well as integrating animal source foods into systems.

With regard to sustainable intensification programs, Mr. Bertram said that if the idea is to drive down poverty and foster nutrition, then these systems need to be more productive than they currently are. This means more nutrients flowing through them, more biomass, more efficient use of water, etc. Basically the Agency is talking about conservation agriculture.

The second system that Mr. Bertram discussed was the mixed mid elevation maize systems in eastern and southern Africa. Despite it being a large and diverse system, there are common challenges: integrating livestock without depriving the soil of organic matter, drought-tolerant maize, integrating high value legumes, etc. The goal is to thread the needle of being responsible for what are essentially global resources while also taking it to the level where it can really pay off and engage local partners.

The third system Mr. Bertram highlighted was the Sudano-Sahelian zone. USAID's focus in this region will be primarily in Ghana with secondary efforts in Ghana. There is huge potential for the greater integration of legumes all over this region. Mr. Bertram said that he had seen beautiful work on striga-resistant varieties, sorghum varieties that Dr. Gebisa and INSORMIL have developed with cowpeas that suppress the striga. In lower-lying areas there is potential for bringing in vegetables and other higher value crops.

Mr. Bertram provided some special focus on Ethiopia. USAID plans to work closely with the Agricultural Transformation Agency and the International Livestock Research Institute. USAID and its partners face many of the same issues in Ethiopia – livestock, biomass, water management, soil management, etc.

Near the end of his presentation, Mr. Bertram quickly highlighted several new items:

- Competitive grants program on drought-tolerant cereals
- Launching a new policy research program
- Changing how the CGIAR system is funded
- CRSPs have trimmed back their programs in non-focus countries and upped the level of focus on specific themes
- Strong focus on M&E and impact

Mr. Bertram left the Board with a sense of where the resources in the Agency research budget are flowing by providing some numbers:

- Climate resistant cereals (rice, wheat, maize, sorghum-millet) – 28%
- Legume productivity – 13%
- Animal and plant diseases – 12%
- Policy and social science research – 12%

- Sustainable intensification – 16%
- Nutrition and nutritious foods – 17%

Mr. Bertram emphasized the intrinsically collaborative nature of the work USAID has been engaged in and thanked his colleagues in other agencies and in the university community for their efforts.

Chair Deaton commented that Mr. Bertram's presentation was very exciting and that hearing about the specificity at the operational level where USAID's work gets done gives him great hope for the tentative process that the Board has been engaged in. Catherine Bertini said that she was interested in hearing how the scientific community is building gender in their thought process, how CG funding will work, and the emphasis on country-driven approaches.

Elsa Murano asked about how USAID is going to focus on the cereal systems, drought tolerance, pest tolerance, and resistance while not diluted any efforts?

Gebisa Ejeta had concerns regarding whether the Agency's efforts will be targeted, laser-like toward achieving particular goals.

Mr. Bertram responded to the Board's comments, beginning with Catherine Bertini. With regard to stunting, USAID plans to build nutrition in at all levels. The Agency is also looking at women as economic agents, managers of resources, and leaders. There is a lot of social science involved. For example, the women in the Sahel managed the sorghum and legumes. USAID is looking at a program to have a little more sorghum in that system. Recently there has been a move from a micro-nutrient focus/vertical intervention to much more of a food-based approach. With regard to CGIAR, USAID has about a third of the resources going into sustainable intensification programs. More than two-thirds of the CGIAR money is going into the new CRPS CGIAR research programs. There will be one rice program that unites all of the rice programs.

In terms of the country-driven strategies, USAID has taken into account all of the information from FARA, from the sub-regional organizations in Africa and Latin America, and the National Academies studies. All of the national partners will be at the inception workshops. As far as CESA in South Asia is concerned, diversification is a large part of the effort. CESA is a rice wheat system that increasingly has more maize, grain legumes, and sugar cane to add value and diversify it. Much of what is happening is driven by family and farmer decisions – the private sector.

Addressing the concerns about the potential dilution of effort, Mr. Bertram said that USAID's intention is to drive diversification by sustaining the productivity of the staples. In terms of partnership, Mr. Bertram said that he welcomed continued guidance from the Board. The delivery component is where mission money comes in and where the Agency gets local partnerships (e.g., local organizations, extension of services, public and private markets).

Public Comment Period

Brady Deaton invited public comment from those present.

Mike McWhirtor from Texas A&M commented that he was stunned at the percentages of post-harvest losses in some of the countries that USAID is involved with. Mr. McWhirtor wondered if there was some way to focus on post-harvest losses. Chair Deaton noted that he has been shocked by the figures as well.

Patrick Binns from Westbrook Associates commented that it wasn't clear what programs USAID has to implement research, capacity building and delivering of conservation agriculture. These items merit high priority and they are not showing up as programmatic areas.

Mark Erbaugh from Ohio State University asked how HICD fits into USAID's restructure of the research portfolio. Mr. Erbaugh also mentioned that the conversation concerning the various synergies between the universities, CRSP programs, and CET centers needs to happen more expeditiously.

Emmy Simmons from the ILRI and IITA boards raised the subject of alignment with HICD strategies.

Robert Mazur from Iowa State University said that he heard nary a mention of value chains for nutrition and how they are integrated into the system.

Hillary Egna from Oregon State University raised the issue of fisheries and aquaculture. Ms. Egna was concerned about the future of this very important sector in the overall portfolio.

Beth Mitchell from the horticulture CRSP and the Post Harvest Technology Center at UC Davis said that only five percent of spending worldwide goes to the area of post-harvest despite an annual loss of 15 to 17 percent. There needs to be an effort to look at cost effective solutions to reduce losses.

Mr. Bertram responded to several of the public comments. The value chains are heavily in the mission portfolios. USAID will certainly be looking at some of the market policy issues that are researchable issues and how to support those value chains. Post-harvest is a tricky subject. Many post-harvest issues revolve around technology in good practices. The Bureau for Food Security has asked undertaken an effort to discern how best to advise missions that are making judgments about where and how to invest. USAID has assets in the CRSPs and other partners in the university system that can be helpful.

Dr. Chapotin addressed the topic of conservation agriculture. Conservation agriculture is a resource conserving technology that is fundamental to building the productivity and resilience of systems. USAID has seen a fair amount of success in using a variety of different approaches to build conservation agriculture and resource conservation technologies from a ground level.

Mr. Bertram closed the comments by noting that human and institutional capacity building is at the heart and soul of the CRSPs and it is something that USAID thinks about in all of its programs.

Panel 1: Perspectives on Human Institutional Capacity Development from the Next Generation of Hunger Fighters

Following a lunch recess, Julie Howard, Chief Scientist for the Bureau for Food Security and the Senior Advisory to the Administrator on Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education introduced the day's first panel. Each member of the panel is a hunger fighter who has had the chance to build their skills through different types of fellowships offered by the US government.

Anabela Manhica is an AWARD (Africa Women in Agriculture Research and Development) recipient with the Mozambique Agricultural Research Institute where she is a senior researcher and head of the Technology Transfer Department. She holds a Master's degree in veterinary medicine from the University of Pretoria. Ms. Manhica said that the AWARD fellowship helped her to identify what she considered to be her life purpose. The fellowship has also been helpful in providing a mentor who is a senior researcher as well as connecting to the international associations. Ms. Manhica added that the fellowship brought to light several performance gaps in her own institution. Those gaps included the 1) diffusion of innovations and 2) the ability to work effectively with the private sector.

Ms. Manhica emphasized the issue of funding. On the job training is very important. Having experts in particular fields come to Africa and share their experiences would be very helpful. The impact might be higher if Ms. Manhica's mentor could go to Africa and work with more researchers, extension offices, and change agents. Investing in women who have decided to pursue advanced degrees in science is highly critical.

Haroon Sseguya is a LEAP (Leadership Enhancement in Agriculture) fellow with Makerere University in Uganda. He holds a Ph.D. in sustainable agriculture from Iowa State. The LEAP fellowship is organized so that the student receives support to go back to an African-based CG center office to do dissertation research while also having the opportunity to meet with their US doctoral mentor on-site in Africa. The fellowship provides money for equipment and a laptop computer. Dr. Sseguya worked at the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT in Spanish) with two programs. The first program involved integrating agriculture and nutrition in Eastern Uganda. The second program was called ERI (Enabling Rural Innovation). Its focus was mainly on helping farmers gain access to markets for their products. One of the groups that CIAT worked with is already marketing its food in the big local food outlets. Working with the CG-based centers assisted Dr. Sseguya to focus his dissertation research. He was able to draw on ten African scientists to help with his research. Dr. Sseguya said that he was given the chance to network with a number of actors through the fellowship that otherwise would not have been available.

One change that Dr. Sseguya would make to his fellowship is to enhance the ability of fellowship holders to link research results to policy, improve pedagogic skills and introduce funding for post docs. Some universities do not have systems in place to provide additional funding for continuing research.

Grace Otitodun is a USDA Borlaug fellow and works with the Nigerian Stored Products Research Institute. Her research interest is in the use of plant materials for protection of stored crops. Agriculture in Nigeria consists largely of small scaled holdings which provide 80 percent of the total food consumed in the country. Post-harvest loss prevention in Nigeria has been conducted with the use of high cost synthetic pesticides.

Some problems with using these pesticides have been their misuse by unskilled farmers and the development of pesticide-resistant insects. Ms. Otitodun said that the Borlaug fellowship has allowed her to conduct research on the insecticidal efficacy of natural materials such as botanicals and diatomaceous earth. Early findings indicate that these natural protectants are capable of effectively protecting stored grains for a long periods of time against pests like the rice weevil and lesser green burrow. Ms. Otitodun said that her experience as a fellow had led her to identify performance gaps in her home institute in terms of the way that research is conducted, e.g. researchers preferring to do research on their own and then hide it from peers. Coming to the US has shown her the importance and effectiveness of collaborative research.

A possible improvement to the USAID program could be to make funding available so that there could be an exchange of visiting scientists between African countries. Money could also be made available for equipment to be used in African institutions. Access to current publications either electronically or in hard copy is critical to staying current with the field. These are not available in Nigeria because research programs are not properly funded.

Gerald Sebuwufu is a current fellowship holder, a graduate student at Iowa State studying crop production and physiology. He is being supported in the graduate program through the CRSP program. Prior to coming to Iowa State he worked as an agronomist at NARO (National Ag Research Organization in Uganda). His research is on the common bean, looking at the biology of iron nutrition, the basis for increase in iron storage in the common bean seed. As part of the CRSP program, Mr. Sebuwufu conducts on the farm research. Apart from the CRSP project, Mr. Sebuwufu has been involved in the value chain of beans from production to marketing. During the summer he has the chance to return to Uganda and get involved in on-farm research.

In terms of how to improve the program, Mr. Sebuwufu said that the foundation of some starter grants is really important because of the lack of research funding in Africa. Training in grant proposal writing would be helpful as well as subscriptions to the relevant top peer-reviewed journals.

Q&A

Catherine Bertini asked the panelists that for every 100 people that are training in agriculture, how many of them have some connection to support from American universities, Chinese universities, and European universities. Jo Luck asked what could be done other than just add money to keep fellows moving forward. In response, Mr. Sebuwufu said that he is from a national agriculture research organization. They get a lot of funding not just from the US government but also from private foundations. The issue of more mentors going back to Africa to train is important. Ms. Otitodun agreed that regular attendance of international and local trainees in workshops, seminars, and conferences is important.

Dr. Sseguya said that the European Union is a big source of funding for his university system. With money from the EU his university is thinking about starting a program called GOforIT (Graduate Opportunities for Innovation and Transformation). The idea is to train graduate students in how to effectively participate in the innovation system on value chains and how to build and manage coalitions. Dr. Sseguya added that after

fellows have been selected it would be important to ask them about performance gaps. Training could then be organized with local regional organizations or USAID. Ms. Manhica said that while most of the funding comes from America, the Continental Institution also contributes funding.

Gebisa Ejeta complimented the panel for their insight and persistence in light of the hurdles that they face on a daily basis. Knowledge building is a long-term process and requires emphasis on continued professional linkages and interaction with mentors.

Panel 2: Human and Institutional Capacity Development - Experts and Perspectives

Gebisa Ejeta began the second panel discussion by presenting a history of human and institutional capacity development by the US government beginning in the mid-20th Century. Dr. Ejeta emphasized the importance of USAID's power as a convening force to rally other development agencies to a more focused strategy for development.

Dr. Monty Jones won the world food prize in 2004. Prior to winning the prize, Dr. Jones was a plant breeder in Sierra Leone. His work on NERICA has increased rice production in Western, Eastern, and Central Africa. In 2001 he received the National Order of Merit of Cote d'Ivoire. In 2004 he received the insignia of the Grand Officer of the Order of the Rokel from the President of Sierra Leone for his work on NERICA. He has been the executive director of FARA since 2002.

Dr. Jones began his remarks by quoting a prominent Malawian: "We know what needs to be done, but every action is constrained by inadequate capacity." This quote relates to the CAADP (Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Program) process and the investment plans that countries are planning together. Good implementation is on the mind but inadequate capacity is the reality. In 2006 FARA carried out a comprehensive mass assessment to look at the capacity of national agricultural research and development systems. The assessment showed deficiencies across the board from small product producers to rural technicians to biotechnology, biodiversity, seed systems, etc. All of these weaknesses were precipitated by two decades of underinvestment. Investment in capacity strengthening is done mostly from external sources. This is unsustainable – there needs to be substantial domestic investment in agricultural activities. Investments for utilization should be increased in an appropriate manner. Too often programs are supported minimally to the extent that the fund is available for salaries and benefits to the detriment of operations and capital needs. Dr. Jones said that he believes that Africa really should be taking care of coming up with a comprehensive strategy for strengthening capacity. There is a serious need to harmonize efforts in order to avoid duplication and overlap.

In terms of assessing gaps, Dr. Jones noted that the data currently available is insufficient to plan and develop a capacity strengthening strategy. However, the CAADP is making progress. In the last year, 29 countries have signed the compact, 20 countries have signed their investment plans, and 14-15 of those investment plans have been thoroughly reviewed. Some success stories in capacity strengthening have been SCARDA, UniBRAIN, ICT, and PAEPARD. Dr. Jones said that the US and other donors can assist Africa in capacity building through advocacy. Advocacy not only needs to exist on the higher education side but also on the harmonization side. Increasing synergy, coherence,

and value for money will go a long way toward achieving the goal of capacity strengthening. Dr. Jones thought that current structures should be strengthened rather than creating new structures. There are too many structures in Africa.

Dr. Cornelia Flora is distinguished professor in sociology at Iowa State University. Before coming to Iowa State she was endowed Chair in Agricultural Systems at the University of Minnesota. She has authored and edited a number of books, her newest is *Rural Communities Legacy and Change*. Dr. Flora began her talk by discussing various forms of sociological “capital.” Cultural capital - part of cultural capital is what one thinks it is possible to change. Retention means staying to work in African institutions. Human capital constitutes the skills and abilities of Africans to be able to interact with each other. It also means identifying those skills and capacities. Social capital is the interaction among different groups. The key issue involves bridging the social capital where African institutions work together when they decide on how to communicate. Political capital is the norms and values that put in the rules and regulations. Financial capital is fairly obvious. Built capital consists of things like roads, IT, lab equipment, etc. Africans will determine the priorities and provide the solutions. US land grant institutions need to make sure that they are helping, facilitating, and supporting the African decision making process.

Some of the most innovative programs were actually funded by the CRSPs where US instructors would be brought in to work in African graduate programs. There has to be an institutional approach using HICD. Part of this approach entails US mentors thinking of themselves as colleagues rather than as gatekeepers. This means sharing rather than imparting knowledge. African and US scientists submitting joint proposals can be important in keeping research grants going.

Problem solving through teamwork provides a different perspective on what an institution does. Small holders can do knowledge-intensive agriculture. The knowledge is embedded in farmers and in technology.

Strategic planning – institutional linkage starts with an institution that has commitment but also means getting advisors who care about particular topics. Students need to be encouraged to do locally relevant research. One of the things that some of the pilot programs that USAID funded through BIFAD were advisors that went to visit students in the field and gave seminars. Funding post-program research should be a priority.

Dr. Mywish Maredia is an associate professor in international development at Michigan State University. She has extensive experience in the area of impact assessment and used to be the director of the Bean/Cowpea CRSP. Dr. Maredia’s presentation focused on clarifying what is meant by human and institutional capacity development, defining the CRSP model, reviewing CRSP achievements and presenting some challenges and innovations in the CRSP approach.

Human and institutional capacity building involves two components: training and organizational development. The CRSP model involves three sets of players: USAID, a management entity, and other US/international organizations including NGOs. The programs are basically investments in research for the purpose of development. Collaborative research projects are sort of the building blocks and defining feature of the CRSP model. The CRSPs build capacity through long-term degree training and short-

term training through workshops, internships, and in-lab training. CRSPs also offer opportunities for facility and infrastructure upgrading. Basically, the CRSP approach focuses on integration and empowers the host country to develop new technologies, knowledge, human infrastructure resources, and competencies in strategic areas.

CRSPs bring comparative advantages to capacity development. The CRSP model allows opportunities for a comprehensive approach, is a great platform for involving and collaborating with diverse partners, and it is the long-term nature of the CRSP project which affords to continue partnership relationships in the long-term.

Traditionally, CRSPs have invested 20 to 25 percent of their funds in long-term degree training. Trainees are selected by the host country collaborators based on their academic potential, professional interests and goals. Post-graduate mentorship is one of the unique features of the CRSP model. It provides post-graduation seed money to trainees when they return home. Long-term degree training fostered by the CRSPs serves as a platform to access world class academic programs and mentors. Dissertation work that comes out of degree training tends to focus on real world problems and constraints. Over the course of the program's history, 4,000 trainees have been trained, 3,500 of these trainees have been trained in advanced degrees. There are currently 350 researchers are getting their support through CRSP. Researchers have a high return rate to their native countries.

It can be a challenge to match trainee talent with institutional needs. Many times a CRSP project may be conducting research in an area where there might be opportunity to train students but the need of that country may be in a different area. There can be a mismatch between opportunity and need. Another challenge is in the form of more and more CRSP projects becoming short-term competitive projects. Some of the specific challenges of the US-based capacity building program are that it has become difficult for many graduate students from Africa and Asia to compete and be admitted on just academic grounds. There are also considerations of academic needs, such as how does a school meet the needs of both domestic and international students. Perhaps what are needed are designer programs for particular needs. How CRSPs can add value to host country graduate programs is another topic for further consideration.

Dr. David Nielson is the Lead Agricultural Services Specialist in the Africa Region of the World Bank. He holds a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Chicago. He is currently the World Bank's lead person in support of the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Program. Dr. Nielson focused his remarks on tertiary agriculture education in Africa. Africa is very concerned about the deterioration of the great agricultural universities that it had at the time of independence and the ability of existing universities to accommodate all of the interested students.

The World Bank and USAID do not always work that closely together. Even though the World Bank is a financial institution that provides development finance, over the last decade the Bank has tried to understand itself as a knowledge bank as well. The current problems are too big for the Bank to take on alone – they must find partners. The opportunity for the Bank to work closely with USAID is highly welcome.

Dr. Nielson said that CAADP is a staggeringly ambitious attempt by Africa to take more responsibility for its own challenges and for its own programs. The ambition of CAADP is to help each country do better at planning, live up to professional level work, and bring

new investment to the table. Everything that the World Bank does in African agriculture needs to be supporting investment plans that CAADP helped countries to put together. Africa's agricultural professionals have taken charge and created the investment plans and the ministries of finance are accepting those as five-year medium term expenditure frameworks for agriculture. Africa responded to the challenge to integrate the agriculture education community by creating TEAM Africa (Tertiary Education for Agriculture Mechanism). This mechanism has put together institutional structures and guidelines about how to address the challenge of integration.

On the development partner side, Dr. Nielson said that there has been a dramatic decline in support for many years. It is very hard to estimate how much the US invested in African agriculture education or how much the World Bank invests. The best numbers available indicate that support from USAID dropped from the mountaintop to the floodplain by the mid-2000s. World Bank has put a \$300 million project for higher level education into its work plan. A third or a half of that will go toward agriculture. The Bank has been working closely with other donors to establish a coalition of donors to put together a big push. There is a chance now to have a much more coordinated effort, coordinated by Africans using the CAADP framework. Dr. Nielson said that there is a great chance to make a big push forward with African leadership.

Dr. Patty Fulton, the National Program Leader at the Center for International Programs, National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) and USDA, was the USDA respondent. Everybody agrees that without human and institutional capacity development being a core area of Feed the Future, the projects in the focus countries are not going to be sustainable. Dr. Fulton talked about the International Science and Education (ISE) competitive grants program implemented by NIFA. Even though the ISE programs are focused on the globalization of US campus-based programs and internationalizing agricultural research, extension and teaching programs – ISE is building capacity at international institutions as well. Dr. Fulton highlighted a program at Iowa State University where students, through their cross-cultural exchanges, are building capacity internationally.

Q&A

Chair Deaton thanked the panel and noted that the impression that one gets is that a great deal is being done yet from a resource standpoint it more is being done with less. Dr. Deaton wanted clarification on problems with specific CRSPs and comments from the panelists regarding reducing the cost to the US or the cost of education.

Elsa Murano asked if there was data that shows the impact on people by efforts by USAID and USDA covering the last several decades.

With regard to new models and sandwich programs, Bill DeLauder asked how many of these types of efforts are underway.

Dr. Flora said that when she tried to go and look at USAID trained agricultural scientists in Africa, she found that the record keeping of USAID was practically nonexistent.

Dr. Maredia added that the challenges that she mentioned during her talk were related to the universities not to specific CRSPs. The changing nature of CRSP in terms of type the

level of funding and the nature of funding is creating a tradeoff between its advantages and disadvantages. It also creates inflexibility in the CRSP in terms of long-term capacity building. Dr. Maredia agreed with Dr. Flora on the lack of documentation issue.

Gebisa Ejeta concurred that this is a really great time to invest in Africa because Africans are committed to the cause and making to the commitment to invest.

Comments

Debrah Rubin who owns a small consulting company that works with BIFAD and USAID as a contractor said that there has been a lot of overlap between the CRSPs. It behooves the Agency to stop separating the CRSPs and the CGIAR work and to emphasize synergies.

Patrick Binns from Seattle expressed his concern that knowledgeable practitioners at the farm level are not as incorporated as true partners in research endeavors. If there is going to be a new move to expand tertiary education into agricultural programming in Africa, it needs to be looked at not only as a one-way form of moving information out, but as a dual channel. Mr. Binns also thought that incorporating things like botanical pesticides needs to find broader application in capacity building programs.

Irv Widders, Director of the Dry Grain Pulses CRSP said that during his travels in Africa, it seemed like many of the students in Bachelor's programs were from urban areas. They were not the sons and daughters of small holder farmers. Mr. Widders thought that fostering more entrepreneurship would be good.

David Hansen, a fellow with the Association for Public Land Grant Universities brought up the need to deal with monitoring and evaluation. Mr. Hansen wondered if there was a body of data available to look at impact assessment in the CRSPs.

Dr. Jones thanked everyone for the great comments and said that Africa is very appreciative of the support that it gets from the US and other partners. After all the years of collaboration, the question that needs to be asked is "How do we move forward?" Is Africa ready to get all this support and to move forward? Given the high level of political support for the assistance, with CAADP and the African Union Commission, Dr. Jones indicated that Africa was ready. CAADP seems to be working because it is the common agenda for African agricultural development. All the efforts should join hands under one umbrella and move forward.

John Yohe, Program Director for the sorghum-millet CRSP program responded to Mr. Hansen's question by saying that USAID is finishing up a study in the next year of 30 years of training in the CRSP.

Chair Deaton thanked the panel for a fabulous session and closed the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

